DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 032 JC 790 038

AUTHOR MacGugan, Kirk
TITLE An Analysis of the Implications of Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act Related to Leeward Community College.
PUB DATE 26 Mar 78
NOTE 62p.; Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Community Colleges; Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Equal Education; *Federal Legislation; *Handicapped Students; *Junior Colleges; *Mainstreaming; Program Descriptions; Program Planning; Rehabilitation; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Leeward Community College HA; Rehabilitation Act 1973 (Section 504)

ABSTRACT

The impact of Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, prohibiting educational discrimination against the handicapped by institutions receiving Health, Education, and Welfare funds, was investigated specifically as it related to Leeward Community College (Hawaii). Information compiled by the Self-Evaluation 504 Task Force at the college, interviews with individuals knowledgeable about the law, and a questionnaire assessing faculty and student attitudes toward program and instructional accessibility for the handicapped formed the basis for the study. A number of federal, state, and university system interest groups were identified as being involved in the implementation of the law. The attitudes surveys revealed that although the information level of instructors was low, they were somewhat interested in the law and in the information possibilities of a workshop; that all interest groups overreacted to fears over costs incurred by 504; most instructors feared facing special education problems they were not trained to handle, yet were very flexible in their thinking about alternative teaching techniques; problems were identified in specific disciplines for specific handicaps; and teachers expressed a sense of being threatened by paraprofessional aides in the classroom. "Project Mainstream" is described as a possibility for meeting the needs of students and teachers. Appendices contain survey instruments, the Mainstream proposal, and a bibliography. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164032

AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF SECTION 504 OF THE 1973 REHABILITATION ACT RELATED TO LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

BY

KIRK MACGUGAN, M.A.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kirk MacGugan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

JC 790 038

NOVA UNIVERSITY

MARCH 26, 1978

Abstract of An Education Policy Systems Practicum Presented to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF SECTION 504 OF THE 1973 REHABILITATION ACT RELATED TO LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

BY

KIRK MACGUGAN, M.A.

MARCH, 1978

Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act prohibits educational discrimination against the handicapped by institutions receiving Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) funds. The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of this Federal Legislation on Leeward Community College, specifically in the areas of Program, Instructional, and Attitudinal Accessibility.

The problems presented by such an investigation were twofold: to identify the organizations and interest groups external to Leeward Community College affected by this legislation which would receive and provide pressure for proper implementation of the law, and, to identify the internal organizations and interest groups at Leeward Community College affected by the legislation which would receive and provide pressure for proper implementation of the law. A sub-problem related to this assessment was the controversial issue of identifying attitudes-toward the legislation, toward the alteration or rethinking required of Program Coordinators, Instructors, and Administrators, and toward the handicapped student who represented

an unknown entity for most Instructors and Administrators.

The procedures utilized to conduct this investigation were working through and with the Self-Evaluation-504- Task Force at Leeward Community College, researching all collected written information of this broadly-based committee in order to specifically analyze all of the requirements and implications of the law relative to one postsecondary institution. Also, interviews were conducted with key individuals who were very knowledgeable about the law and who would best be able to identify pressure and interest groups on and off campus: the Leeward Community College Handicapped Officer and director of the 504 Task Force, the director of Komo Mai-special services for the handicapped at Leeward Community College, the coordinator of programs for the disadvantaged at Leeward Community College, and the director of Kokua - special services for the handicapped at the University of Hawaii. Lastly, a questionnaire was given to all faculty at Leeward Community College prepared by the instructional sub-committee of the 504 Task Force. This questionnaire sought information regarding Program and Instructional Accessibility for the handicapped at Leeward Community College and also contained attitudinal questions concerning the law itself.

This investigation revealed a multitude of federal, state, and university system interest groups involved in the implementation of this Federal Legislation. The identification of these groups provided insight into the political interaction surrounding the implementation of this law. This investigation also revealed the problems which accompanied the implementation of such broadly-based Federal Legislation - problems of program and instructional

alteration, facilities alteration, attitudinal alteration, and cost considerations. These problems were identified only for Leeward Community College but their broader application was perceived.

The main thrust of this study was to investigate the political process involved in (504) in order to determine the need for and feasibility of researching, funding, and conducting "Project Mainstream" at Leeward Community College: mini-workshops aimed at instructional technique for and understanding attitudes of the handicapped. All postsecondary institutions, after conducting an analysis of (504) of this nature, should institute a Project Mainstream for Instructors, Administrators, and staff and should utilize their investigation in the workshops.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND & SIGNIFICANCE	5
PROCEDURES	13
RESULTS	18
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
APPENDIX	37
FOOTNOTES	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52

INTRODUCTION

There are a number of complications involved in the implementation of Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act in postsecondary educational institutions.

If one were handicapped, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, pronibiting educational discrimination against the handicapped and providing educational accessibility to all handicapped by law, would be a most encouraging act of Congress. Next only in importance to desegregation laws and non-discrimination and affirmative action laws in other areas. If, however, one were a postsecondary instructor with no 'special education' background and not handicapped, this legislation would be not only another example of the intrusion of the Federal Government into state and local affairs but because of its mandates that all handicapped be included in the regular educational process, it would be threatening. Many instructors do not feel professionally prepared to provide the special services they envision themselves performing for their handicapped students.

If, on the other hand, one had been a Counsellor or Parent of the handicapped or a volunteer in a local service agency which lobbied for equal educational access for the handicapped, one would react favorably to the law and press for its proper implementation. A school Administrator, though, would forsee problems with the implementation of the law - expenditures, facility rennovation, possible law-suits, pressure from opposing interest groups.

In other words, similar to most broadly-based Federal Legislation which touches a unique and vocal segment of the population, there would be disagreements over the wisdom of the law, and, how the law should be ultimately implemented. Interest groups would form on one side or the other of the law and the processes to be employed in its implementation. The stage would be set for political interaction. Everyone responsible for the law would need to identify all of the organizations and interest groups, and attitudes which provided pressure and impacted on the implementation of this law. According to the law, schools have a year to perform a self-evaluation of their services relative to the handicapped (1978) and three years to fully implement the law - by 1980. Only by recognizing all of the interest groups involved in this issue and by providing a setting of interaction for them would all - especially the handicapped student - achieve the most effective accomodation.

There is a related everpresent, undercurrent issue which would effect the kind of political interaction surrounding this law - an attitudinal problem. As surrounded the de-segregation laws of the 50's and 60's, there was not only a specific group of people involved in these laws but very specific attitudes toward them. The attitudes were the barriers. The law broke through them and the physical movement and determination of the Black population worked to implement laws around and in spite of conflicting attitudes. But, this was very difficult and it left the movement with a sense of unfulfillment in many instances. The handicapped face exactly the same situation with regard to

the equal educational accessibility laws. The main barriers are attitudinal. More of a problem because it is extremely difficult in the mid 70's to admit to any discriminatory hold-overs in action or attitude. And, the thought or realization that, unknowingly, one discriminates against the handicapped is disturbing. "How could one do that - those poor people!"

The purpose of this study was to assess the implications of this equal educational accessibility law as it affected one postsecondary institution - Leeward Community College. The study, therefore, had to assess the political interaction surrounding the law and its implementation by identifying the divergent organizations and interest groups affected by the law. The study, also, had to recognize the conflicting and sometimes fearful attitudes toward the handicapped which influenced how the law would be implemented. Particularly, the study investigated the procedural and attitudinal problems related to Program and Instructional Accessibility at Leeward Community College. The study had to investigate both the External campus influences and the Internal campus influences related to the law. The study specifically dealt with one Community College but its relatability to a broader perspective was implied.

This investigation was primarily conducted by surveying or researching all available resources at Leeward Community College which were in any way related to Section 504. This included being a member of the Self-Evaluation-504-Task Force and working on specific problems of implementing the law at this Community College. With members of the Instructional sub-committee of this Task Force, a questionnaire was written which

attempted to identify the major problem areas in Program and Instructional Accessibility for Leeward Community College Instructors and handicapped students. In the questionnaire, the sub-committee wished to identify the present level of involvement between instructors and handicapped students, and to identify the need for and availabliity of specific auxiliary services for the handicapped. The sub-committee wanted the questionnaire to act as an encouragement for instructors to re-think the specificity of their course outlines, and to survey the faculty on their knowledge of 504 and interest in exploring the technical and attitudinal ramifications of the law in a workshop format.

BACKGROUND & SIGNIFICANCE

On April 28, 1977, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), Joseph Califano, signed the regulations implementing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. "Section 504 prohibits discrimination against qualified handicapped persons in all federally assisted programs or activities. These regulations, which will become effective on June 3, 1977, will have an impact on virtually every public school system, post-secondary institution, social service agency, and health care provider in this nation."[1] This law, Section 504, is part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and is built on the premise that the handicapped in this country represent an excluded and disenfranchised minority primarily because they have not been included in the privileges provided by a mainstreamed educational process. Secretary Califano singled out the mainstreaming educational emphasis in the law in a statement which he wrote to initially accompany Section 504:

> For decades, handicapped Americans have been an oppressed and, all too often, a hidden minority, subjected to unconscionable discrimination, beset by demoralizing indignities, detoured out of the mainstream of American life and unable to secure their rightful role as full and independent citizens. ...The 504 Regulation attacks the discrimination, the demeaning practices and the injustices that have afflicted the nation's handicapped citizens. It reflects the recognition of the Congress that most handicapped persons can lead proud and productive lives, despite their disabilities. It will usher in a new era of equality for handicapped individuals in which unfair barriers to self-sufficiency and decent treatment will begin to fall before the force of law. The 504 Regulation will work fundamental changes in many facets of American life. In many cases this regulation calls for dramatic changes in the action and

> attitudes of institutions and individuals who are recipients of HEW funds. In implementing the unequivocal congressional statute, this regulation opens a new era of Civil Rights in America. 2

The hardest-hitting requirement of 504 is that no longer will handicapped persons be segregated in private and public schools. They must be mainstreamed into the educational process-or - "be educated with the non-handicapped in regular classrooms to the maximum extent possible."[3] All educational institutions which are recipients of HEW funds must provide complete Program Accessibility to all handicapped either with alterations or additions to existing program offerings. An additional controversial aspect of 504 is the length to which the concept of handicapped is streatched: "Attorney General Griffin Bell, on April 12, 1977, issued a formal opinion stating, "It is our conclusion that alcoholics and drug addicts are handicapped individuals for purposes of ... Section 504."[4] Accompanying these mandates of Section 504 are others which are equally difficult to accomodate: educational institutions must maintain a running three year self-evaluation of their experiences with and implementation of 504; physical facilities must be accessible; methods of program operation must be "integrative -- i.e., mainline"; the teaching of certain courses must be adapted to facilitate the handicapped; examinations must reflect achievement and not "impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills;" auxiliary aides shall be made available when necessary; equality of vocational counselling opportunities shall be provided; involvement in athletics must be accessible to the handicapped; and grievance procedures must be instituted on a campus by campus or system-wide basis.[5]

Despite the obvious problems in interpreting and implementing 504, many handicapped and non-handicapped resented the fact that it took the HEW Secretary more than four years to sign these specific regulations of the Rehabilitation Act and was only then catapulted into action after a countrywide series of demonstrations and sit-ins, on behalf of the regulations. Reminiscent of ideas of political effectiveness in the David Easton Political Systems Model, the demands and support for the regulations which became 504 had been legislatively circulating for many years building in intensity until they could influence political decision-making and action.

The first instance in this century when the power of the handicapped minority and their supporters began to show itself was in 1961 when the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) published, "Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to and Usable by, The Physically Handicapped."[6] This publication, liberally utilized in the writing of 504, was the product of advocacy efforts of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. Through the next two decades, advocacy groups for the handicapped multiplied and, although frequently categorized by handicap, coalesced into a potential power movement. The handicapped worked through power-brokers at the beginning of 1960 but established alliances with other power bases in the present decade to achieve many of their aims. And, although diversified in limitation, their aims have remained constant and are best expressed in the 1961 ANSI document mentioned earlier:

> Disabilities are specific and where the individual has been properly evaluated and properly oriented and where architectural barriers have been eliminated, a specific disability does not constitute a handicap. It should be emphasized that more and more of those physically disabled are becoming participants rather than spectators, in the fullest meaning of the word. 7

In 1976, State Conferences on Handicapped Individuals were held to discuss legislative action and to elect delegates to a White House Conference on the Handicapped in May, 1977. The State Conferences were especially electric and exciting, but the delegates who assembled in Washington were confidant and determined about influencing future legislative action because Section 504 had been signed into law that April. Time Magazine reported the significance of the White House Conference:

> The Conference authorized by Congress at a cost of $3 million is the latest indication that America's 20 million to 35 million handicapped are the nation's newest civil rights movement. In 1973, following two decades of lobbying plus court rulings against discrimination, Congress passed a sweeping Vocational Rehabilitation Act for the mentally and physically disabled. 'No handicapped individual,' it proclaimed, 'shall be excluded from any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.' 8

The literature on the impact of 504 is not specific nor detailed as yet because, historically, the law is in its own early stages of implementation and its influences are yet to be felt. The most obvious impact of the law will be economic. But, this will not be the only, or, perhaps, even the greatest involvement with Section 504, which will likely lie in the realm of human contact between handicapped and non-handicapped and the attitudinal changes which accrue from contact. Some of the implications of this law can only be estimated at this point:

> Drafting a regulation has been a most difficult task because Section 504 prohibits discrimination against the handicapped in broad and unequivocal terms and yet the Congress enacted the Section without legislative hearings and with virtually no floor debate in either House. There is, thus, little Congressional guidance on the host of complex issues raised by Section 504's far-reaching prohibition against discrimination. 9

The present state of the literature is also primary meaning not much is available yet beyond the law itself and the paper work surrounding its implementation.

A study of the implications of Section 504 for the Leeward Community College campus was significant for a number of reasons. To refer to the state of literature on this issue again, a study such as this one added some much needed specific information about one postsecondary educational institution's experiences with 504. The study had the potential of a first-hand and very specific account of the impact of a piece of Federal Legislation on one postsecondary educational institution. It also had the potential of illustrating the processes of policy system making and its influence at the institutional level relative to the implementation of this law.

Specifically, for Leeward Community College, the study provided a one-source-compilation of everything that had been done to date to fulfill the requirements of Section 504. A campus coordinator and special Task Force had been selected to inform on and administer the regulations. They had been at work since June of 1977 and had completed some important initial studies including a Plant and Program Accessibility Study and a Transition Plan setting forth the steps necessary to make the

plant and its programs completely accessible. The Task Force worked through sub-committees on Leeward Community College's first Self-Evaluation Plan relative to Section 504. They kept complete records of all activities related to 504. This study provided not only an up-to-date record for this group and others interested in the issues sorrounding 504, but also provided additional and most recent resources on the law.

The Leeward Community College Task Force Coordinator believed that this study acted as an impetus for the Task Force at a time when its energy level and interest was abating. The identification of the interest groups which have evolved around the processes of implementing the 504 regulations provided opportunities for new discussion between these peoples recognized as representing differing points of view on how 504 would function. When interest groups are nebulous and ill defined, the possibility of compromise and accomodation is weakened. This study identified these interest groups, even to themselves, and made possible compromise and accomodation in interpreting and implementing 504. Such interaction is the political process.

Primarily, this study <u>began</u> the very important task of identifying attitudes - of teachers, administrators, staff, non-handicapped, and handicapped - toward the law, toward the discrimination base upon which the law is built, and toward those necessary institutional and instructional steps involved in fulfilling the law and providing true educational mainstreaming. Identifying attitudes is the beginning of understanding action or non-action, and is the first step necessary for effective and constructive change. The Provost's charge to the Task Force:

> Included in the self study must be processes for assisting the College in mainstreaming the handicapped into our programs and activities. A crucial element will be the development of activities for assisting Leeward Community College staff in examining their own beliefs and attitudes toward mainstreaming.10

This practicum began the study portion of what would ultimately lead to "Project Mainstream" on the Leeward Community College campus - the development and use of consciousness/attitudinal mini-workshops to be conducted at the beginning of every semester by handicapped and non-handicapped instructors for students, teachers, administrators, and staff. To develop these workshops, data had to be collected, analyzed, synthesized, and reorganized into effective workshop form. "Project Mainstream" had been on file in the office of Staff and Instructional Development (OSID) at Leeward Community College since Fall, 1977. This study would advertize its possibilities to a larger faculty and administrative audience. These workshops would prove to be of institutional value to Leeward Community College and would, ultimately, serve to solve the problems of implementation of Section 504. This was a major point raised at the Hawaii State Conference for Handicapped Individuals:

> Because handicapped persons have special needs and problems peculiar to themselves, it is recommended that all professionals have their consciousness raised to the problems of the handicapped. This should be accomplished by a change in the curriculum for professionals to emphasize the handicapped person as a total being. Staffs in residential facilities should be given special training in this area. 11

Or, an even better summing up of this final significance was found in the Time Magazine article referred to earlier:

The able bodied must also be educated about the handicapped, however and this may prove the hardest problem of all. As one handicapped person put it at a pre-conference hearing, 'Our bodies make us disabled but society makes us handicapped'. 12

PROCEDURES

The data collected in order that this investigation could begin was, first, the files on 504 kept by the Task Force in the Office of Staff and Instructional Development. These files contained a compilation of all campus studies and activities related to 504, correspondence concerning 504, and any newspaper or magazine articles published in Hawaii and elsewhere which were pertinent to 504. This was a running file which was constantly studied and which was the primary source for identifying those differing opinions and attitudes surrounding the controversies within 504.

Secondly, it was helpful to conduct interviews with key individuals who were very knowledgeable about the law and who were best able to identify pressure and interest groups and attitudinal problems on and off the Leeward Community College campus. These individuals were: John Fry, Handicapped Officer and director of the 504 Task Force at Leeward Community College; Ed Lau, Komo Mai director of special services for the handicapped at Leeward Community College; Mimi Nakano, coordinator of programs for the disadvantaged at Leeward Community College; and, Grace Merritt, Kokua director of special services for the handicapped at the University of Hawaii. The Leeward individuals identified here had also chaired initial sub-committees for the Leeward Community College Self-Evaluation-504-Task Force. The chairman of the Physical Facilities sub-committee was not interviewed because, by the writing of this Practicum, the facilities Transition Plan had been completed and was on file.

Lastly, a questionnaire was prepared and utilized - one worked out by and in conjunction with the Instruction sub-committee of the 504 Task Force. Instead of offering the question-naire to specific faculty targets, it was circulated to all parttime and fulltime Instructors. The thrust of the questionnaire attempted to identify any presently known or forseeable Program and Instructional problems related to Leeward Community College's handicapped population. The questionnaire also sought attitudinal problems in relation to teacher fear and frustration, and, surveyed the faculty on their interest in a possible "Project Mainstream." An originally proposed Administrative questionnaire was dropped because as this study progressed, it was directed more toward Instruction and Program Accessibility and, colleagues were working on 504 studies from an administrative standpoint.

While looking into existing campus files on 504, an accompanying procedure was to keep a record of those instances in which interest groups were obviously identified in the literature and when opposing views and attitudes were expressed. Since this literature also dealt with information not specifically related to Leeward Community College but to the broader issues involved in 504, these areas of controversy were generally identified and an attempt made to make a specific relationship to Leeward Community College. In the interviews conducted, the accompanying procedure was to determine these individuals' perceptions of interest groups and attitudinal problems related to 504, and relate these views from the campus to the broader perspectives in the literature - to find a consistent correlation.

With the questionnaire, the accompanying procedure was to identify the major problems of Program and Instructional and Attitudinal Accessibility for the 504 Task Force, and, to attempt a comparison of the specific problems identified at Leeward Community College with those more generally identified in the literature.

In order that this study might be replicated, a copy of the final questionnaire utilized and a summary of the responses to it are incorporated in the Appendix of this Practicum Report. Also, a copy of the questions utilized in the interviews is included in the Appendix, and, a copy of "Project Mainstream" as originally drafted. Since this study primarily involved one Community College campus, any written information remains there and can be restudied and re-evaluated at another time. All files on 504 will, however, eventually be moved from the office of Staff and Instructional Development to the Main Administrative offices.

There were a number of assumptions upon which this study was based. Given the constraints of the law it was assumed that the activities emanating from 504 on the Leeward Community College campus paralled those 504 activities on all postsecondary campuses which received HEW funds. It was assumed that Leeward Community College's problems related to implementing 504 were not unique - that all postsecondary institutions posed the same general set of problems, primarily because the Instructional Population would be quite similar. And, it was assumed that, although the numbers differed, there was a similarity in the

Handicapped Population; the needs expressed by students and instructors in relation to implementing 504 were universally parallel.

However, at the same time that the above assumptions were recognized, it also became apparent that this study was bounded by certain limitations. Many of the physical facilities of Leeward Community College were built with the handicapped in mind. The campus is not completely accessible but certainly more so than many community college campuses. This fact limited the extent to which the study could identify instructor and student frustration related to physically moving about the plant. There are also three quite active and vocal handicapped instructors at Leeward Community College. This was a limiting factor because their history and presence at Leeward Community College, and their work on 504 issues, helped soften the blow of understanding some of the requirements of the law. The law turned these individuals into overnight experts on the education of the handicapped; this also included instructors who were parents of handicapped children. The fact that Leeward Community College had already established Komo Mai - special services for the handicapped - also limited the impact of 504 ascertained by this study. This well organized and efficiently-run service had been providing slow and steady contact between the handicapped student and the Leeward Community College campus. In other words, it was possible that the impact of 504 would not seem as great at Leeward Community College as at other colleges because the consciousness level of the population about the handicapped

had been sufficiently raised.

Lastly, although the questionnaire utilized in this study was not the only procedure employed, it was understood that the internal validity of this procedure depended on the specific number and types of responses to the questions. If the response was good - or - an adequate number responded, the effect would be significant because the information gathered here - as throughout the study - would become part of "Project Mainstream" and would supply needed analyzable material for the organizing of mini-workshops. Since this was a one-campus-based-study, the internal validity of the procedures were not as limiting since whatever problems were revealed would be problems that Leeward Community College itself had identified and which needed attention.

The response to the questionnaire, the procedures and limitations of the study would need to be examined with the external validity of this study in mind. Leeward Community College is one of a multitude of institutions where struggles over 504 are occuring. The information from the study, and, especially, the questionnaire would be extremely valuable in its potential to be generally applied to other populations. Despite the presence of the limitations mentioned, the reliability and value of this study would lie in its experience-base. It was based on information of experiences of teachers, administrators, staff, and students - with implementing Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act.

RESULTS

Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act is Federal Legislation. Although its enactment is primarily overseen by HEW, the implications and complexities involved in its implementation encouraged the HEW to establish the Office of Handicapped Individuals under the auspices of HEW. Its responsibility is the continual examination of what is being done and planned for handicapped individuals throughout the Federal government.[13] Also, a House sub-committee on Select Education was charged with full implementation of Section 504.[14] The chairman is John Brademas of Indiana. Any interaction that takes place around this law - lobbying for proper implementation or for clarification of or alteration of the law - between the Federal and State levels, would have to involve these Federal areas. Lastly, for postsecondary educational institutions, Section 504 encouraged the development of campus or systems grievance procedures for the handicapped, but also provided the handicapped the option of suing without first exhausting administrative remedies.[15] This has allowed the steady development of judicial involvement and legal precedent to also enter into the picture of the interactive forces at work in the implementation of 504.

The State government's involvement with 504 was also deflected, through numerous state offices under the aegis of the Governor: the State Manpower Commission has direct responsibility to many handicapped individuals in the middle manpower spectrum who seek its help in education or employment - the Commission was particularly interested to know about the community college efforts surrounding 504; a relatively new organization on the scene was the State Commission on the Handicapped also

specifically interested in the education as well as the employment of the handicapped in Hawaii and in possession of a legal mandate to coordinate state services for the handicapped; the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Services (DVRS) was specifically involved in 504 - when auxiliary aides were requested by handicapped students or educational institutions - DVRS was expected to help lessen the expense of 504 for many schools. In 1977, the state office of the Attorney General became involved in 504 because it had to recommend approval of the advertisements postsecondary institutions had to write and have printed in public and school newspapers declaring their compliance with 504. Not to be overlooked at the State (and Federal) level would be those areas of concern which provide Health Delivery Services. Also, groups representing individual handicapped concerns - the Associations for the Blind, Deaf, Retarded, Paraplegic, etc. All of these groups represented potential for present and future involvement in and interaction over 504.

At the University of Hawaii, the Chancellor showed interest in a number of specific responsibilities related to 504. He oversaw the anti-discrimination publication announcements, as did the Provosts of the various community colleges. The University expressed concern with the grievance procedures to be utilized by the handicapped encouraging each campus to develop its own internal procedure. And, the University Facilities Planning Office made a space inventory survey of Leeward Community College with the facilities mandates of 504 in mind - checking the accessibility of the campus for the handicapped. A copy of the

Leeward Community College Transition Plan was forwarded to the office of Chancellor for the Community Colleges. These efforts showed an interrelationship developing over 504, within the University System and between the University and the State. The political processes surrounding the implementation of 504 became more complicated and more specific when moving from the Federal down to the State and Local Postsecondary Institutional Level.

On the campus of Leeward Community College, Interest Groups emerged out of either a direct or indirect relationship to Section 504. The Administration, for the most part, were involved by law only in that they received compliance directives firsthand and had first view access to all communications on the law. Some administrators worked on committees assigned specific compliance or implementation duties. The vast majority waited and watched to see what the varied campus and country reactions to the law would be. A few took the role of 'devil's advocate' to protest the vague aspects of the law.

The Self-Evaluation-504-Task Force (working out of the OSID) and the Komo Mai (services to the handicapped) staff and workers and the staff of the Reading and Writing Laboratory were directly involved in 504 and actively pursued its implementation in all aspects, and were converted to the compliance of the law from the stand point of philosophical perspective. This group worked under administrative mandate, but they worked more actively for the law than did the Administration. Other service groups on campus had more of a peripheral involvement with 504 and were encouraged into any kind of action by contact

with or as Task Force committee members rather than by any primary or overriding interest or activity of their own: the Veteran's Administration services on campus, the Counselling staff, the Student Services office, and the Facilities Services staff.

Leeward Community College Instructors, as a group, were semi-interested in the law, not overly sensitive and wary about those inplications of the law which touched on program and instructional accessibility. Vocational-technical instructors were a bit more aware of some of the ramifications and possibilities in the law as their experience with a greater number and variety of handicapped students was a bit more extensive. The vocational-technical instructors also foresaw a greater involvement for themselves with a greater variety of specific task-oriented instructional and learning problems than did liberal arts instructors. All Leeward Community College instructors exhibited about the same degree of panic over having to quickly comply with Section 504 - to hurriedly rethink how a Blind, Deaf, or Quadraplegic student could be accomodated to the way the instructor was presently doing things, in order to accomodate learning. Many instructors found it helpful to have been a member of the 504 Task Force where the emphasis was always on possibilities for instructors as well as students. And, the Task Force was broadly-based, extremely inter-disciplinary; it crossed Division lines and represented a large campus network. Either direct membership on or contact with the Task Force was a helpful 'handicapped education' for many instructors.

Leeward Community College students represented the next level of involvement with or interest in Section 504. If they were not handicapped, they were probably not involved unless they worked for Komo Mai or were a volunteer tutor or aide. The point is, though, that there were a good number of handicapped students at Leeward Community College and they were generally knowledgeable about the law and a few of them were quite vocal. This group's involvement incorporated the last interest group considered here - the Leeward Community - not as yet actively involved or interested or probably as informed as they should be.

The interaction of these campus interest groups created many 504 problems for Leeward Community College most of which were not unique to this campus. The 504 Task Force early in its work identified the potential pitfalls in implementing 504:

> to forsake thoroughness for expediency in order to avoid lawsuits,
>
> to not provide the least restrictive environment,
>
> to argue over reverse discrimination,
>
> to delay remedial steps,
>
> to interpret qualified handicapped too narrowly.[16]

The various groups involved in 504 argued frequently over the concept of 'qualified handicapped' - some seeing that this was a way to eliminate the more severely handicapped from certain classes and programs, others envisioning the possibility of open access for the handicapped to all programs, classes, and educational institutions. The problem of determining qualification got mixed up and lost in the argument over identifying the handicapped student. The Dean of Student Services argued that

to identify the handicapped without their consent in some kind of registration procedure was a violation of their right to privacy. The Task Force argued that past discrimination through lack of services could not be undone unless some kind of voluntary pre or post registration identification process took place.[17] These arguments orbit the campus in a holding pattern - and further discussion of qualification waits in the wings. The law itself broadly defines qualified handicapped with respect to postsecondary and vocational education services: a person who meets the academic and technical standards requisite to admission or participation in the recipient's education program or activity.[18]

All groups overreacted to what were later termed as - unfounded fears over costs incurred by 504. There would, undoubtedly, be some hidden cost effects of the law- paper work, administrative staff - but the first thoughts on rennovation of all existing physical facilities resulted from a misreading of the law. Just as well, the fears over costs of auxiliary services for the handicapped proved short sighted as to how the law attempted to relate costs to existing state rehabilitation services. For Leeward Community College, long range cost estimates apprximated $200,000 and immediate or short range plans were estimated at a cost of $25,000.[19] No discussion of the cost of Section 504 involved itself with the monies saved in getting certain handicapped individuals off Social Security, Welfare, or Disability or Unemployment payments and, through education, getting them employed, their salaries circulating and benefitting the economic system. No cost discussion concerned

itself with a healthier society or less health service costs for handicapped people who were either employed or in school.

All Leeward Community College instructors, whether liberal arts or vocational-technical, had problems with the 'possibilities-range' of Section 504. Meaning - it was difficult not to respond first to 504 in a negative manner. "A blind student can't be taught to draw." "A student in a wheelchair can't get around in a classroom filled with dangerous equipment." "A deaf student cannot succeed in a lecture-oriented class setting." The examples of asking a negative question about a possible handicapped student were legion. Every instructor envisioned themselves facing a special education problem they had no training to handle and, consequently, felt taken advantage of by the law. This frustration resulted in many different kinds of reactions the worst of which was the 'take pity' response of some University teachers - not at all the thrust of the law- of inflating grades.[20]

The questionnaire prepared by the Instruction sub-committee of the Leeward Community College 504 Task Force revealed a number of frustrations with the law similar to the one just mentioned. The tendency was not to think in terms of substitutes if one was not handicapped. So where wheels become legs, hooks become hands and the silent moving mouth speaks loud and clear to the deaf ear, the instructor or program coordinator who has not had to deal with such alternatives as yet responds with such seemingly logical comments as: "One must have hands to make puppets; one must hear to transcribe speech sounds; one must see or hear to grasp or relay abstractions." Despite these problems and frustrations, the Instruction sub-committee questionnaire portrayed

the majority of Leeward Community College instructors as interested in discovering how to solve any problems they faced with their handicapped students. They were extremely flexible in their thinking about alternate teaching techniques which could be utilized with various handicapped students.

The questionnaire identified specific problems of and with handicapped students by division or, in many cases, discipline: the difficulty of the blind students in certain visual art classes, similar problems were identified for drafting classes, the danger of working with certain equipment in automotive engineering or food service or oceanography, the problems that handicapped students have with high typing desks or laboratory benches and machines which are foot operated, the inconvenience of doing blackboard work which the blind cannot see nor the deaf hear. Generally the attitudes which Instructors expressed on the Leeward Community College questionnaire were positive - attitudes toward having increased numbers of handicapped in their classes and toward seeking information and help for these students and modifying certain traditional classroom activities.

Two aspects of the response to the questionnaire were supportive of pre-conceived ideas of the Instruction sub-committee. The information level of the Leeward Community College Instructor about Section 504 was low because there have not been as great an influx of handicapped students onto the campus as are eventually expected. Instructors were seen to be waiting for that eventuality to spur them into seriously thinking about course or program modifications. Despite this waiting game, though, Instructors wanted to know more about 504, and were

interested in the informational possibilities of an information session or mini-workshop on 504. Almost every instructor expressed concern that the presence and whereabouts of auxiliary services be made more knowable to them - that there be an information center about the futures of 504.

As good a job as the Leeward Community College 504 Task Force did, there was a sense of 'hurry up' in their activities, a'get through the requirements' syndrome. There was a good deal of disorganization - and a sense of stopping after a job had been completed. For example, they did not ask for responses to the Transition Plan. They produced a tremendous amount of paper work - how it will all be utilized remains to be seen. The part of the Leeward Community College facilities which did respond to the Transition Plan was the library. Their willingness to overcome or aid handicapped students to cope with some accessibility problems in the library was indicative of the level-headed thinking of many administrators, instructors, and program coordinators. They identified the lack of an accessible toilet in the library. They also had excellent suggestions for replacing the heavy entrance doors and access around the turnstile at the entry/exit door. They were willing to extend their service of reach and carry relative to low or high shelves or inaccessible floors. Something as simple as a paper-cup dispenser would make library study much easier for the handicapped and this was one of their good, inexpensive suggestions. The extremely small elevator in the library remains a problem but a finally agreed-upon identified one and the library staff approached this problem with numerous alternatives.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Specific problems of Leeward Community College Instructors related to Program and Instructional accessibility were identified in the literature, interviews, and questionnaire, but problem attitudes were perceived - as attitudes are much more difficult to survey. Generally, attitudes at Leeward Community College concerning 504 ran the 'attitude - ladder' found in most of the literature: beginning with Indifference because what might become a problem with more handicapped students had not become a problem yet, to Ignorance of what exactly to do when one was faced with a particular handicapped student and what exactly 504 specified and required of teachers and the educational profession, to Fear of the Unknown as more and more Instructors and Teaching Assistants sought help and information from those campus facilities which offered special services to the handicapped - the Reading-Writing Lab, Kokua, Komo Mai. Requests from Instructors seeking help for a specific problem related to a handicapped student have increased since May, 1977 - both on the Leeward Community College and University of Hawaii campuses. At the University, Departments have made requests for counsellors. At Leeward Community College, inquiries to Komo Mai have increased concerning deaf students and students with psychiatric problems. And, the Leeward Community College Reading-Writing lab has had more referrals from state rehabilitation counsellors and inquiries about services from out-of-state.

The accompanying perception was that the 'attitude-ladder' is in the process of being scaled by postsecondary teachers because there is a slow but steady increase in the numbers of handicapped students attempting a higher education. As contact between the handicapped and non-handicapped increases, the whole range of possible attitudinal responses (very familiar to the handicapped) comes into play. One of the best descriptions of this attitudinal range is found in a Phi Delta Kappan article by Edward L. Solomon where he relates his experiences in mainstreaming the handicapped into a public school in New York:

> Our new unit had to be matched and meshed with the regular school program. It was easy to integrate all children into the lunchroom, the assembly, the gymnasium and even into the various shops. The real difficulty lay in providing time and space for some of the handicapped children in the academic areas. The regular teachers were <u>fearful</u>.. Some were <u>repelled</u>. Some were <u>anxious</u> because of <u>feelings of inadequacy</u>. <u>Some provided generous doses of pity but little understanding or acceptance</u>. Some special education teachers felt that their domain was being threatened and that they alone knew how to teach their wards. There was <u>suspicion</u> and some <u>hostility</u>. It ended with the full experience of sharing. 21

From discussion with Leeward Community College Instructors on 504 and even from the questionnaire, the range of attitudes described above were perceived - even to the territoriality of certain teachers about their materials and their presentation of those materials. A disturbing attitude picked up at Leeward Community College was the <u>threat</u> felt by certain Instructors over having certain paraprofessionals in their classes accompanying and aiding the handicapped - interpreters, signers, note-takers. This attitude was akin to the expression of one Instructor, "Well, nobody can do it (teach) like I can."

But, the paraprofessionals were also seen as a disturbance to the instructor as were the possibilities of having to deal with more than one handicap at a time.

Equally disturbing was the continual discussion about and reference to Segregation in Special Education classes still being idealized as best for the handicapped. Also, segregation at the postsecondary level by handicap, by consortia, by program of study. Only contact produces change; only contact can break down this attitudinal barrier which is thrown up for a number of reasons ranging from sincere conviction to fear.

> The inclusion of the full spectrum of handicaps was important for both the handicapped and for the normal child. To segregate the disabled child would allow him no opportunity to see another child overcoming a different handicap. Just as keeping him from full participation in a normal school setting deprives the handicapped child of learning to share and to accept and to understand people's differences, so would the exclusion of differently handicapped classmates keep him from a true appreciation of our diversified society. The normal child, who shares his school with students of varying abilities, must learn that there is a population less fortunate than he. Unlike the economically deprived, who can be helped by infusions of money into the schools, these people will always be handicapped, despite all the help they may receive. The normal child must learn to understand, to accept, and to work with people who are in any way limited in body or mind. 22

It is when faced with the overwhelmingly depressing aspects of continued segregation and isolation by the non-handicapped that the determined attitudes of the handicapped themselves were perceived. The changes proposed in 504 cannot move quickly enough for them. Their attitude of impatience is tempered only by years of discouragement and disillusionment. They are becoming a new public seeking their civil rights.

> ... there is a unique minority: the handicapped. A relatively small group in the general population, they can never hope to become the majority, control the vote, or rise up and combat their oppressors. The only place the handicapped constitute a majority is in segregated institutions where they are isolated and therefore without influence. They remain only peripherally included in the concerns of the electorate and find themselves almost totally dependent upon sympathetic, but non-handicapped, participants in the political process.
>
> Why should the handicapped have to come hat in hand to beg for what is theirs? Why must they depend upon the largesse of the healthy and fully functioning majority? Why must they struggle to justify their existence? Must they feel less human because they cannot offer a roster of heroes? Whould they fade from the scene because they cannot see, hear, move, or function as well as members of the majority? When will the handicapped be accorded the right to participate in America's abundance without apology? 23

The implications of a study such as this one were legion. If the study circulated among Instructors and Administrators at Leeward Community College, the possibility of further and more meaningful dialogue among the identified campus interest groups was likely. The hoped for Instructional and Program accomodation for the handicapped at Leeward Community College growing out of this interaction was also likely. With greater group interaction, the hidden effects of the law could be brought into the open and more honestly dealt with - cost effects, effects on teaching methodology, attitudinal effects. This study also held up the potentialities of sharing the Leeward Community College experience with 504 with other postsecondary faculties and institutions. Not only a sharing of the problems identified in Program, Instructional, and Attitudinal Accessibility but a sharing of the approaches utilized at Leeward Community College to solve these problems. Specifically, a sharing of some of the

activities and arguments of and surrounding the 504 Task Force.

There were many vague aspects of this law and problems in interpretation. If 'qualified handicapped' were defined any more narrowly, it could increase the isolation of the handicapped and reinstate selected segregation. The Leeward Community College 504 Task Force struggled with this problem and did not always grasp the moral implications involved. Their struggle was coupled with whether or not they should become an advocacy group aimed at the estimated 8,000 handicapped in Hawaii. The problem was a modern educational problem: socialization versus social reconstruction. Educational institutions have always advocated socialization - the training of prepared and aware citizens through the educational process. But, social reconstruction, similar to affirmative action is the process of seeking out areas of societal crisis and becoming an involved advocate on the side of a particular issue. The handicapped need such advocacy support in Hawaii. They literally need to be brought into the educational process. Many on the Leeward Community College 504 Task Force wanted to perform this role for the handicapped of the Leeward area of Oahu. Others balked at such interference in human rights, settled for advertising Leeward Community College's facilities and programs accessibility, but condemned out and out recruitment. The implications of this issue were important because every postsecondary educational institution has to decide on its levels and areas of advocacy. The handicapped also have a right to participate in all the benefits of citizenship; - and, it has been previously established in this country, that some human rights can only be realized for some people by the force of law.

This argument has implications of its own - judicial ones. If postsecondary institutions do not accept some advocacy responsibility, then the courts will probably eventually force this responsibility on them. It is conceivable that handicapped students could sue for proper transportation, open access, and revised and revitalized learning programs. The law implies social reconstruction as handicapped citizens also demand access to voting places, to government buildings, to legislators, - to an equal mainstreaming of American life. The government and courts will not become less involved in our educational futures - but more involved.

This study implied that the educators needed to be educated. Instructors simply needed to recapture one of the basic tenets of education - flexibility in methodology, that half of what teaching is all about is the imaging of possibilities. Handicapped students are frequently more determined and motivated. At this moment of educational crisis in our country when illiterates are being graduated, teachers could become re-encouraged by the 'splendour of their mission' by working with students who tried hard and learned well. This experience might even help in the restoration of standards, in the reconstruction of the educational process.

The above is impossible, however without adequate administrative support. School Administrators must take some first line responsibility toward implementation of the law. They must be involved in the arguments, attitudinal changes, advocacy controversies, and program and instructional needs of their faculties and handicapped students. The futher implications of

such interaction are great. Consider cross-cultural Hawaii. The unity given diversity that this state could exemplify to the rest of the country is almost inspirational. Postsecondary Administrators could lead in this very human and humanizing effort. Every postsecondary institution should establish an ongoing and systematic program which incorporates the requirements of the law, which continually evaluates the needs of its handicapped students and the instructors who work with them, and maintains implementation of the law.

> A lasting change in public attitudes would be the most meaningful 'bill of rights' for handicapped individuals. George Jackson at Howard University points out that corporate executives, government officials, and college and hospital administrators tend to move up or out every few years. 'We sensitize management to the needs and abilities of handicapped people', Dr. Jackson says, then there's a big turnover at the top and we have to start over. A fair shake for disabled people needs to be built into the system.' 24

Specifically, in relation to the State of Hawaii, it is recommended that the State Commission on the Handicapped also accept its advocacy role and concentrate on coordinating services for the handicapped in the state by extensive advertising. If it needs a bigger budget for this activity, the informed handicapped can lobby for such. The participants in the State Conference on Handicapped Individuals wanted to see the establishment of some kind of ombudsman for the handicapped in Hawaii. The State Commission could either be or help find a mechanism to provide this service.

> It is important in each state to develop and maintain an adequate planning, coordination and evaluation linkage between education and other human service programs at the state level. The situation may be particularly acute in states where state education

> agency directors are elected and other state agency officials are appointed. Oftentimes this situation results in differing political backgrounds and constituencies which can work against effective inter-agency program planning and program development, especially between human resources and education. 25

The State Commission on the Handicapped could act as an 'umbrella' organization as far as information services were concerned.

Accompanying these recommendations, there must be more legal service information provided for the handicapped. This could be done through the educational process - specifically in special services offered to the handicapped on postsecondary campuses, or, this information could be provided through some kind of legislative mechanism. The Komo Mai office at Leeward Community College, for example, plans to extend its services by offering legal information to handicapped students. Title V of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act (Sections 501-504) is a "bill of rights" for disabled people. Handicapped people must not be discriminated against in any aspect of our national life that is supported in full or in part by United States dollars. They have a right to know and act on that bill of rights.

The State of Hawaii also has a serious Transportation Problem relative to the handicapped. The law requires education. The handicapped cannot be educationally mainstreamed unless they can get to the educational facility. The proposed Rapid Transit System does not fulfill this need.

Within the State's postsecondary system, this study highly recommends the Leeward Community College 504 example and Task Force as methods which have worked in implementing Section 504.

Leeward Community College needs to continue the excellent work it has begun. This study makes three recommendations relative to Leeward Community College but applicable to any other post-secondary educational institution. First, those services which Leeward Community College already supplies for the handicapped or for the disadvantaged learner - Komo Mai, the Reading-Writing Laboratory - need to be extended in scope and with much more support from the school as a whole. These services are in need of financial assistance and moral support from the Administration. And, since they provide much needed services for the students, they should receive as much adequate administrative and cross-administrative-agency support as possible. Administrations need to get into the habit of 'talking up' and advertising campus services they should be proud of.

Secondly, the Office of Staff and Instructional Development is working on a plan for a Learning Assistance Center. This study envisions this service as a meaningful aid to the Leeward Community College Instructor and forsees the 504 Task Force continuing its efforts as an arm of that center. Headed by the Leeward Community College Handicapped officer, this arm of the Learning Assistance Center would coordinate information and services for Leeward Community College Instructors relative to their handicapped students and their inquiries about alternate teaching methodologies.

Lastly, "Project Mainstream" needs to be initiated on the Leeward Community College campus. This service of mini-workshops could bring students and Instructors together to discuss needs of handicapped students, needs of their teachers, and the

breaking down of attitudinal barriers which separate the handicapped from the mainstream of life. The coordinators of "Project Mainstream" would work out of the Learning Assistance Center and would provide on-going information for the Handicapped Officer and 504 Task Force. "Project Mainstream" could also be a Leeward Community College 504 project shared with (on) other Community College campuses. It could make the difference in the successful implementation of Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act.

APPENDIX

Questions Asked In Interviews

Do you perceive that the number of handicapped students on campus has increased since June, 1977?

Do you perceive that the number of Instructor (Teaching) Problems has increased since June, 1977?

Do you perceive any problem groups developing since June, 1977?

Do you perceive any attitudinal problems since June, 1977?

- Students
- Instructors
- Administrators

What recommendations relative to 504 do you make at this point?

Instruction sub-committee Questionnaire On Program and Instructional Accessibility for the Handicapped.

Divisional Responses:

Business	12
Math & Science	24
Language Arts	23
Social Science	14
Arts & Humanities	21
Vocational-Technical	12
Counselling	1
Total Responses	117
Total Faculty	200 approx.

Number who checked 'no requests' had been made by handicapped students - 82

I. **Auxiliary Aides** SURVEY ON INSTRUCTION RELATIVE TO LEARNING NEEDS OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS AT LCC

Please answer by checking (✓) the following based on your experience as a teacher at LCC during the Fall, 1977 and Spring, 1978. If no requests have been made, place an X here ___, and turn to the next page.

Subject Area _____ Full Time _____ Part Time _____ Total Enrollment for Fall, 1977 _____ Total Enrollment for Spring, 1978 _____

NAME OF AUXILIARY INSTRUCTIONAL AIDE/SERVICE	No. of Requests Made Due to a Handicap Indicate by No.	Were You Able to Provide the Aide? Please check one. Yes	No	If no, it was because you Didn't Know Where To Get It?	Didn't Think It Was Necessary?	Looked But It Wasn't Available?	Other: List Other Alternatives
1. Interpreter/Signer	4	✓ 4					
2. Written Verson of Class Material	5	✓ 5					
3. Tutorial Services	27	✓ 27					
4. Note Takers	6	✓ 5	✓ 1				
5. Cassette Recorder							
6. Large Print Books/Brailled Materials							
7. Films or Slides with Captions							
8. Talking Records							
9. Low Tables							
10. Wheelchair	2	✓ 2					
List other aides of solutions not listed above.							
11. Speech & Hearing Therapy Programs	7	✓ 7					
12. Oral Exams	1	✓ 1					

II. Objectives

Consider the courses you are teaching. Are there content areas/tasks which are mandatory for passing the course that a qualified handicapped student could not achieve. Indicate by completing the following:

NAME OF COURSE	CONTENT AREA/TASK	TYPE OF HANDICAP	WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM

FOR INSTRUCTORS:

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
1. Do you know and understand the general requirements of (504)?	46	32	27
2. Would you attend an information session on (504)?	62	14	27
3. Do you understand the concept of mainstreaming as far as the Handicapped are concerned?	57	25	20
4. Would you attend a mini-workshop on the Teacher and the Handicapped Student covering instructional techniques and understanding attitudes concerning the handicapped?	55	16	32

PROJECT MAINSTREAM

Leeward Community College
June, 1977

Project Director: Ms. Kirk Macgugan
Project Associates: Ms. Mimi Nakano
Mr. John Fry

Project Title: Mainstream

Project Goal: To facilitate the accessibility to and successful use of programs and activities by handicapped persons in Hawaii.

Project Objective:

To provide opportunity for program and activity personnel

(a) to understand and gain an increased awareness of the handicapped person's needs

(b) to gain an increased self awareness of personal attitudes, stereotypes, and biases relative to the handicapped

(c) to gain an increased awareness of how to assist those handicapped with special needs.

Project Rationale/Need

Disabled citizens now have fundamental rights guaranteed to them by law. However, legislation cannot dictate awareness and attitude change. There exists diverse and often times prejudicial attitudes towards the handicapped person. Whether it be a relative, friend, associate, the general public--each may require assistance in re-evaluating their respective attitude toward mainstreaming the disabled.

On April 28, 1977, Secretary Joseph Califano signed the regulations which implement Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. In compliance with these regulations each institution receiving Federal money must assess its programs and activities (relative to the disabled) and assure accessibility to all qualified handicapped persons.

In November, 1976, PL 94-142 "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act" was signed and it is to be initiated by October, 1977. It requires "placing (handicapped students)... in regular classrooms to the fullest extent."

Both of these laws emphasize mainstreaming the disabled and will pose special problems and conditions for government, education, businesses, and private organizations. The problems will not only be in materials use, activities designed, or facilities renovation, but in recognizing and dealing with the attitudes of personnel in each of these organizations towards mainstreaming.

To accept the commitment to fulfill the spirit of the laws and confront the task of assisting personnel in various areas in working with mainstreaming effectively, consciousness/attitudinal change workshops are needed. To develop these workshops data must be collected, analyzed, synthesized and reorganized into effective workshop form. To do this an experienced, historical and sociological researcher, Ms. Kirk MacGugan, has volunteered to research and develop the workshop plan.

However Ms. MacGugan, a life-long paraplegic and confined to a wheel chair will be undergoing an operation in August, 1977 and will be in a body cast from August, 1977 to June, 1978. During this period of recuperation Ms. MacGugan will be able to read, write, and continue the research analysis if the actual library research and interviewing processes are carried out by an assistant under her supervision.

This qualified person hired to assist Ms. MacGugan will be provided inservice education, clerical support, and research direction from the Office of Staff and Institutional Development. Further support in developing awareness of needs of handicapped will be provided by Komo Mai (a Leeward Community College student service group) and by the coordinator of Programs for the Disadvantaged (Ms. Mimi Nakano).

The results of the CETA/SCET assistance will be providing immediate effective support for a disabled person and ultimately assisting in producing a product which will assist handicapped throughout the city and state.

Activities

Preparing for and Implementing the Collection of Data

To prepare a workshop design which will fulfill the goals and objectives stated above for assisting in mainstreaming the handicapped, the following data will be collected.

(a) Existing attitudes of specific ethnic groups by ages relative to the handicapped person

(b) Recorded examples of the historical treatment of the handicapped in Hawaii by the various ethnic groups in Hawaii

(c) Existing attitudes of the Hawaii handicapped persons to his/her treatment by (1) parents, (2) schools, (3) colleges, (4) government agencies, (5) commercial establishments (6) public at large

(d) recorded examples of problems caused by (unconscious or conscious) attitudes toward the handicapped.

(e) recorded examples of alternative solutions used to resolve problems caused by an appropriate attitudes towards the handicapped.

(f) other data to be determined.

The data will be collected through a

(1) Community Survey

An instrument to survey the attitude towards the handicapped will be designed by the project director, the LCC Office of Staff and Institutional Development (OSID), and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), and the Special Education Coordinator in consultation with the following agencies:

The Hawaii Library for the Blind and Handicapped;

The Veterans Rehabilitation Center;

The Vocational Rehabilitation Office;

The Citizens for the Advocacy of the Handicapped;

University of Hawaii, KOKUA

A sample population will be surveyed by

(a) group interviews with selected community organizations by assisting members of the project team

(b) group interviews of high school classes, and University of Hawaii classes by members of the project team

(c) individual interviews of designated city government, state government, education and business offices by members of the project team

(d) other means to be determined.

(2) Literature Search (ERIC)

(a) LCC Library

(b) Manoa Library

(c) State Library

(d) Hawaii State Archives

(3) Informational Exchanges

(a) Mainland colleges

(b) Federal agencies

(c) Mainland and Japan, and Philippine individuals

The data collection processes will be designed and implemented by a project team:

Project Director (Ms. Kirk MacGugan)

Project Associates (Ms. Mimi Nakano)

(Mr. John Fry)

Research Assistant (to be hired)

Analyzing the Data

All data collected will be reviewed and analyzed by the Project Director. Assistance will be provided by the OIR computer analyst as requested for coding, keypunching and data processing. The Director of the OIR will assist in reviewing the data.

Designing the Workshop

Collected data will be summarized and discussed in a written narrative by the project director.

The narrative will be the basis for a workshop design developed by the project team in cooperation with the LCC Office of Staff and Institutional Development.

Personnel Description

(a) Position Titel: UH Reserach Associate I

(b) Minimum Qualification: BA in Special Education, Sociology, or related field; (research expertise or experience working with disabled desirable); ability to prepare written reports, ability to understand and follow oral and written instructions relative to literature research; ability to communicate with others; access to and able to drive a car.

(c) Brief Description of Duties: Assist the project director in basic library research; collect information in readable form; interview pre-arranged appointees on a specific topic; compile reports; deliver collected information to the project director.

(d) Description of Training (if any): Constant supervision and training in basic research techniques; will be provided inservice training in research in interview techniques by LCC Office of Staff and Institutional Development; inservice training on needs of handicapped from Komo Mai*

Evaluation

Measure of Effectiveness	Criteria
(1) Sufficient data from community survey to prepare narrative	Acceptance of project team
(2) Sufficient data from Literature Search/ Informational Exchange	Acceptance of project team
(3) Adequacy of the narrative for preparing a workshop design	Acceptance of project team
(4) Acceptance of workshop design by agencies	Minimum of 4 agencies

* LCC special service to the handicapped.

Milestones	Projected Timeline
Project Personnel hired	By Aug. 1
Instrument Designed	
Interviews Identified	
Survey Completed	
Literature Search Completed	
Informational Exchange Completed	By Dec. 30
Data Analyzed	By Feb. 1
Narrative Written	By March 1
Workshop Design Completed	By May 1

Budget

Activity		Cost
Personnel		
Project Director (9 cr. hrs x 2 sem x $429)		$ 7,722.00
Project Associate (3 cr. hrs x 2 sem x $429)		2,574.00
(Ms. Nakano)		
Research Assistant (9 mo x $692)		6,228.00
	Subtotal	16,524.00
Indirect Cost (28% of 16,524.00)	$4,626.72	
Fringe (1.4% of 16,524.00)	231.34	4,857.06
	Personnel Costs	21,382.06
Supplies		
Paper - 5000 (1 ream)	20.00	
Duplicating - [illegible]	10.00	
Mailing - 1000 x 2 x 13¢	260.00	
Research narrative supplies	25.00	315.00
Other		
Mileage (40 miles/5 times/week/30 weeks) = 6000 miles @ 15¢)		900.00
		$22,597.06

FOOTNOTES

[1]Letter from Joseph A. Califano Jr., Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., May 1977.

[2]HEW NEWS, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Statement by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary, Concerning Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act (0-234-665, April 28, 1977) (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977),p.1.

[3]Ibid., p. 3.

[4]Ibid., p. 5.

[5]Federal Register, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicapp regarding Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefitting from Federal Financial Assistance (Vol. 42 No.85, May 4, 1977) (Washington: Federal Register, 1977), pp.22676-22681.

[6]American National Standard Institute, Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to, and Usable by, The Physically Handicapped, A Report Prepared by ANSI, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped (New York: American National Standards Institute, 1961), pp.1-12.

[7]Ibid., p.7.

[8]"D-Day for the Disabled," Time, May 30, 1977, p.44.

[9]HEW NEWS, Califano, Op.Cit., p.7.

[10]Letter from Provost Phillip K. Ige, Leeward Community College, Pearl City, Hawaii, June 13, 1977.

[11]Hawaii State Conference on Handicapped Individuals, Final Report, Recommendations Presented to Governor George Ariyoshi and The Hawaii State Legislature (Honolulu: The Rehabilitation Hospital of the Pacific in conjunction with the State White House Activities, 1976), p. 20.

[12]"D-Day for the Disabled," Op. Cit.

[13]The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, Special Concerns, State White House Conference Workbook (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development, 1977), p. 18.

[14]National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, GR&L Alert, A Report Prepared by NASPA Division of Governmental Relations And Legislation (Lexington: Washington and Lee University, 1977), p.7.

[15]Ibid.,pp.5-6.

[16]Leeward Community College Self Study Task Force, Information On Existence And Location of Accessible Programs And Activities For The Handicapped At Leeward Community College (Honolulu: Leeward Community College (Honolulu: Leeward Community College, 1977),p. 29.

[17]"Conflict is Feared in Task Force Aims", Ku'i Ka Lono to spread the news, October 7, 1977, p. 1.

[18]Federal Register, Op.Cit., p. 22678.

[19]Leeward Community College, Minutes of Administrative Staff Meeting (Pearl City, Hawaii), pp. 1-2.

[20]Interview with Grace Merritt, Director of Kokua, University of Hawaii, March 16, 1977.

[21]Edward L. Solomon, "New York City's Prototype School for Educating the Handicapped", Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1977 pp. 8-9.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., p.7.

[24]The HEW Task Force on Public Awareness and the Disabled, "It's A New Day For Disabled People", American Education, December, 1977, p. 21.

[25]State White House Conference Workbook, Special Concerns, Op.Cit., p. 50.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary. Non-discrimination on the Basis of Handicap. Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 85, May 4, 1977.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary. Statement by Secretary Joseph A. Califano, Jr. Concerning Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act. HEW NEWS, April 28, 1977.

Books

Blocker, Clyde E., Bender, Louis W., and Martorana, S.V. The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University Press, 1975.

Articles and Periodicals

"Conflict is Feared in Task Force Aims," Ku'i Ka Lono to spread the news, Vol. 17, No. 6, Leeward Community College (October 7, 1977), p. 1.

"D-Day for the Disabled," Time, (May 30, 1977), 44.

"Hope Is The Future," Kamea Hou, Vol. 1, No. 2 (February 12, 1978), 4-5.

"How the Law Will Affect You: A Guide to the New Handicapped Act", NEA Reporter, Vol. 16, No.7(October, 1977), 6-7.

Jones, Ron. "The Acorn People", Psychology Today, (June, 1977), 70-81.

"Komo Mai: Past and Present", Kamea Hou, Vol. 1, No. 1 (February 6, 1978), 3-5.

"Schooling The Handicapped", NEA Reporter, Vol. 16, No. 9 (December, 1977), 8-13.

Solomon, Edward L. "New York City's Prototype School for Educating the Handicapped", Phi Delta Kappan, (September, 1977) 7-22.

Spriesterbach, D.C. and Farrell, William J. "Impact of Federal Regulations at a University," Science, Vol. 198, No. 4312 (October 7, 1977), 27-31.

The HEW Task Force on Public Awareness and the Disabled. "It's A New Day For Disabled People," American Education, (December, 1977), 17-21.

Reports

Akamu, Tom. Facilities And Services For The Physically Handicapped At Colleges In The State of Hawaii. An Information Guide for Counsellors, Parents and Students. Honolulu: Leeward Community College, June, 1974.

American National Standards Institute. Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to, and Usable by, The Physically Handicapped. New York: American National Standards Institute, 1961.

Fry, John. Report on Meeting on Handicapped, Section 504, at Hawaii State Capitol. June 30, 1977.

Fry, John. Report on Status of Leeward Community College's Self-Study on the Handicapped. Administrative Staff Meeting, Leeward Community College, November 21, 1977.

Hawaii State Conference on Handicapped Individuals. Final Report. Recommendations Presented to Governor George Ariyoshi And The Hawaii State Legislature. Honolulu: The Rehabilitation Hospital of the Pacific and the State White House Activities, 1976.

Johnson, Carole M. The Needs of Learners with Handicapping Conditions in Postsecondary Occupational Education. Prepared for The National Workshop to Improve Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Personnel Development Programs. Columbus: Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, February 20-24, 1978.

Leeward Community College Self Study Task Force. Information On Existence And Location of Accessible Programs And Activities For The Handicapped At Leeward Community College. August 1, 1977.

Leeward Community College Self Study Task Force. The Community College Educator And The Handicapped. Understanding The Non-discrimination And Equal Accessibility Laws of 1977. August 4, 1977.

Leeward Community College Self Study Task Force. Transition Plan for the Physical Facilities at Leeward Community College - Section 504. Novenber 30, 1977.

NACUBO Special Report 77-6. HEW Issues Final Rules For The Handicapped. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1977.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Questions and Answers On Regulations Implementing Sec. 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Prepared by NASPA Division of Govermental Relations and Legislation. Virginia Beach: Tidewater Community College, July, 1977.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. GR & L Alert. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504: An Update Report on Legislative, Regulatory and Case Law Development. Prepared by NASPA Division of Governmental Relations and Legislation. Lexington: Washington and Lee University, December, 1977.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Purposes and Performances of Higher Education in the United States Approaching The Year 2000. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company, June, 1973.

The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. State White House Conference Workbook, Educational Concerns. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development, 1977.

The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. State White House Conference Workbook, Social Concerns. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development, 1977.

The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. State White House Conference Workbook, Special Concerns. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development, 1977.

The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. The National Newsletter. Washington D.C.: The White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Spring, 1977.

Other Sources

Leeward Community College. Personal Interview with Ed Lau, director of Komo Mai. March 16, 1977.

Leeward Community College. Personal Interview with John Fry, Self-Study Tack Force Coordinator. January, 1978.

Leeward Community College. Personal Interview with Mimi Nakano, Coordinator of programs for the disadvantaged. March 16, 1977.

Letter from Donn G. Kessler, Deputy Attorney General, State of Hawaii, October, 4, 1977.

Letter from Evalani Machado, Evaluation Committee Chairman, State Commission on Manpower and Full Employment, State Advisory Council of Vocational Education, Office of the Governor, October 13, 1977.

Letter from Joseph A. Califano Jr., Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. May, 1977.

Letter from Provost Phillip K. Ige, Leeward Community College, Pearl City, Hawaii, June 13, 1977.

Memorandum from John Baker, Dean of Student Services, Leeward Community College, Pearl City, Hawaii, August 22, 1977.

Memorandum from John Fry, Self-Study Task Force Coordinator, August 25, 1977.

Memorandum from Kenneth K. Kunisaki, Coordinator of Student Services, office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges, University of Hawaii, September 12, 1977.

University of Hawaii. Personal Interview with Grace Merritt, director of Kokua, March 16, 1977.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 2 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES